



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/339,159 06/24/99 KAUPPINEN M 5440.204-US

STEVE T ZELSON ESQ
NOVO NORDISK OF NORTH AMERICA INC
405 LEXINGTON AVENUE SUITE 6400
NEW YORK NY 10174-6401

HM12/0927

EXAMINER

RAO, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1652

DATE MAILED:

09/27/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/339,159

Applicant(s)
Kauppinen et al.

Examiner
Manjunath N. Rao

Group Art Unit
1652



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 26, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 1 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 1-31 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 1652

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-3, 9-11, 13, 14, 20-29 and 31, drawn to an isolated mannase, classified in class 435, subclass 200.
 - II. Claims 4-8 and 12, drawn to an isolated polynucleotide, vectors and host cells, classified in class 435, subclass 252.3.
 - III. Claims 15-16, drawn to a method of improving properties of cellulosic or synthetic fibers using the enzyme, classified in class 435, subclass 277.
 - IV. Claims 17-19, drawn to a method of degradation of plant material using the enzyme, classified in class 435, subclass 267.
 - V. Claim 30, drawn to a process of machine treatment of fabrics, classified in class 435, subclass 263.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
3. Inventions I and II are patentably distinct from each other. The polypeptide of group I, the polynucleotide of group II, each comprise amino acid sequences and nucleotide sequences which are chemically unrelated, do not require each other for practice; have separate utilities, such as use of the group I polypeptide to catalyze glycolytic reaction versus the use of

Art Unit: 1652

polynucleotide in a hybridization reaction and are subject to separate manufacture and sale. The groups have acquired separate status in the art and separate fields of search.

4. Inventions I and III, IV, or V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the enzyme of group I can be used to raise antibodies as opposed to its use in any one of groups III-V.

5. Inventions II and III, IV or V are patentably distinct from each other. The polynucleotides of group II is neither made nor utilized in any of the methods of groups III-IV or the composition of group V. They do not require each other for practice. They are subject to separate sale and manufacture. The groups have acquired separate status in the art and separate fields of search.

6. Inventions III and IV or V, are patentably distinct from each other. The method of improving properties of cellulosic fibers of group III, the method of degradation of plant material of group IV, a process of machine treatment of fabrics of group V are unrelated as they comprise distinct steps, utilize different products and produce different results. They are subject to separate

Art Unit: 1652

manufacture and sale. The groups have acquired separate status in the art and separate fields of search as further evidenced by their separate classification.

7. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Claims 1 and 31 are directed to a genus of mannase polypeptides.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species (a specific mannase SEQ ID NO) that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to

Art Unit: 1652

be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

9. A telephone call was made to Carol Rozek on 9-18-2000 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).


10. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

Art Unit: 1652

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manjunath Rao whose telephone number is (703) 306-5681. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, P.Achutamurthy, can be reached on (703) 308-3804. The fax number for Official Papers to Technology Center 1600 is (703) 305-3014. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Manjunath N. Rao

September 21, 2000



PONNATHAPU ACHUTAMURTHY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600